arXiv:1604.03770v1 [quant-ph] 13 Apr 2016

BCCB COMPLEX HADAMARD MATRICES OF ORDER 9, AND MUBS

BENGT R KARLSSON

Abstract. A new type of complex Hadamard matrices of order 9 are constructed. The studied matrices are symmetric, block circulant with circulant blocks (*BCCB*) and form an until now unknown non-reducible and non-affine two-parameter orbit. Several suborbits are identified, including a one-parameter intersection with the Fourier orbit $F_9^{(4)}$. The defect of this new type of Hadamard matrices is observed to vary, from a generic value 2 to the anomalous values 4 and 10 for some sub-orbits, and to 12 and 16 for some single matrices. The latter matrices are shown to be related to complete sets of MUBs in dimension 9.

1. Introduction

Complex Hadamard matrices have turned out hard to describe in a uniform manner and a comprehensive understanding of such matrices has only been achieved in orders $N \leq 5$. At higher orders, the number of known complex Hadamard matrices, or orbits of such matrices, is growing (see the catalogue in [1]), but no general construction or classification principle has emerged. For example, almost all known complex Hadamard matrices are either isolated, or elements in affine orbits stemming from a seed matrix, typically but not exclusively the Fourier matrix F_N. However, non-affine orbits have also been discovered, and in order 6 such orbits play a major role. As another example, prime order Hadamard matrices might be thought of as more elementary than those of composite order. Indeed, almost all known complex Hadamard matrices of orders $4, 6, 8, 9, 10$ and 12 can be seen as composed from F_2, F_3 and F_5. However, the most general, non-affine orbit in order 6 is not composed of F_2 and/or F_3. For an overview of complex Hadamard matrices, see [1, 2, 3, 4].

In view of this situation it is of some interest to identify and categorize as many different (orbits of) complex Hadamard matrices as possible. As a contribution to these efforts, in this paper we report a new orbit in order 9, of a kind not encountered before and therefore of relevance for the ongoing efforts to better understand the full set of complex Hadamard matrices.

2. Notation and definitions.

A complex Hadamard matrix H_N is an $N \times N$ matrix with complex elements of modulus 1, and such that $H_N^\dagger H_N = NI$ (the unitarity constraint). Here, I is the identity matrix. In this paper, all matrices referred to as Hadamard will be of this kind. Hadamard matrices exist for any N, as exemplified by the Fourier matrix with elements $(F_N)_{ij} = \omega_N^{(i-1)(j-1)}$, with $\omega_N = \exp(2\pi \mathrm{i}/N)$.

Two Hadamard matrices H and $\tilde{H}$ are said to be equivalent, $H \sim \tilde{H}$, if there exist diagonal, unitary matrices D_1, D_2, and permutation matrices P_1, P_2 such that

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05B20, 15A36.

Key words and phrases. Complex Hadamard, 9 dimensions, *BCCB*, mutually unbiased.

$H = P_1 D_1 \tilde{H} D_2 P_2$. For each Hadamard matrix there is an equivalent dephased matrix with all elements in the first row and first column equal to 1.

In higher orders, several-parameter orbits of Hadamard matrices are prevalent. Two such orbits will be considered equivalent if for each matrix in one there is an equivalent matrix in the other. A matrix which is not part of an orbit is termed isolated.

An orbit of dephased complex Hadamard matrices is affine if the phases of the elements are linear functions of the orbit parameters.

A Hadamard matrix of even order is H_2-reducible [5] if it is equivalent to a matrix where all the 2×2 submatrices are also (in general enphased) Hadamard matrices. More generally, a composite order Hadamard matrix is reducible if it can be seen as built from Hadamard submatrices of order 2 or more.

In a circulant matrix [6], each row is a copy of the previous row shifted one step to the right, with wrap around. The columns of $F_N^\dagger$ are eigenvectors of any such $N \times N$ circulant matrix. If in a circulant matrix $C_{n_1} = \mathrm{circ}(a^{(1)}, a^{(2)}, ..., a^{(n_1)})$ of order n_1 the elements $a^{(i)}$ are replaced by order n_2 circulant submatrices $A^{(i)}_{n_2}$, the result is an order $N = n_1 n_2$ block circulant with circulant blocks ($BCCB$) matrix, which has the columns of $F^\dagger_{n_1} \otimes F^\dagger_{n_2}$ as eigenvectors.

The defect [1, 2] of a unitary $N \times N$ matrix with elements $H_{ij} = \exp(\mathrm{i}tR_{ij})$ equals $d(H) = r - (2N - 1)$, where r is the dimension of the solution space for $\frac{d}{dt}(H^\dagger H) = 0$. In a p-parameter orbit of Hadamard matrices, $d(H) \geq p$, and its generic defect is the smallest defect encountered along the orbit. There may exist suborbits with larger generic defect, and in particular individual matrices with a larger defect.

3. Low order Hadamard matrices

In order 2, all complex Hadamard matrices are equivalent to the Fourier matrix on standard or circulant form,

$$F_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{or} \quad C_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \mathrm{i} \\ \mathrm{i} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \sim F_2. \tag{3.1}$$

This matrix is isolated.

Also in order 3, all Hadamard matrices are equivalent to the Fourier matrix on standard or circulant form,

$$F_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \omega & \omega^2 \\ 1 & \omega^2 & \omega \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{or} \quad C_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \omega & \omega \\ \omega & 1 & \omega \\ \omega & \omega & 1 \end{pmatrix} \sim F_3 \tag{3.2}$$

where $\omega\,(= \omega_3) = \exp(2\pi\mathrm{i}/3)$. Again, this matrix is isolated.

In order 4, all Hadamard matrices are equivalent to an element in a one-parameter affine orbit, the Fourier orbit $F_4^{(1)}(a)$ in the notation of [1]. If written on manifestly reducible form, or circulant and $BCCB$ form, this orbit can be represented by

$$\begin{pmatrix} F_2 & \Delta F_2 \\ F_2 & -\Delta F_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{or} \quad \begin{pmatrix} 1 & t & -1 & t \\ t & 1 & t & -1 \\ -1 & t & 1 & t \\ t & -1 & t & 1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.3}$$

where $\Delta = \mathrm{diag}(1, x)$ is a diagonal, enphasing matrix with $x = \mathrm{i}\exp(\mathrm{i}a)$, and where $t^2 x = 1$, $x, t \in \mathbb{T}$. This orbit is H_2-reducible and it is the lowest order example of an orbit of reducible Hadamard matrices. While the generic defect of the orbit is 1, at the point $x = 1$, i.e. for the matrix $F_2 \otimes F_2$, the defect takes the value 3 [1].

In order 5, all complex Hadamard matrices are equivalent to F_5, an isolated Hadamard matrix.

In order 6, not only affine but also non-affine orbits have been found. The three-parameter, non-affine orbit $K_6^{(3)}$ [7] contains the affine suborbit $F_6^{(2)}$ but also all previously described, smaller non-affine orbits ($B_6^{(1)}$ [8], $M_6^{(1)}$[9], $K_6^{(2)}$ [10], $X_6^{(2)}$ and $X_6^{(2)T}$ [11]). It is itself a suborbit of a larger but not yet fully understood non-affine orbit $G_6^{(4)}$[12]. Furthermore, $K_6^{(3)}$ exhausts the set of H_2-reducible matrices of order 6, making the general elements of $G_6^{(4)}$ together with the isolated matrix $S_6^{(0)}$ stand out as the lowest, composite order Hadamard matrices that are not reducible. In this order, a few circulant [13, 14] or $BCCB$ Hadamard matrices exist, e.g. $C_2 \otimes C_3$, but there are no orbits of such matrices [15]. The generic defect of $K_6^{(3)}$ and $F_6^{(2)}$ is 4.

In order 9, which is the case of main interest here, the Fourier orbit $F_9^{(4)}(a,b,c,d)$ [1] is the only orbit found until now. It is an affine orbit with generic defect 4, and it can be written on the equivalent and manifestly reducible form

$$F_9^{(4)}(a,b,c,d) \sim \begin{pmatrix} F_3 & \Delta_1 F_3 & \Delta_2 F_3 \\ F_3 & \omega\Delta_1 F_3 & \omega^2\Delta_2 F_3 \\ F_3 & \omega^2\Delta_1 F_3 & \omega\Delta_2 F_3 \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.4}$$

where $\Delta_1 = \mathrm{diag}(1, x_1, x_2)$, $\Delta_2 = \mathrm{diag}(1, x_3, x_4)$, $x_1 = \omega_9 e^{\mathrm{i}a}$, $x_2 = \omega_9^2 e^{\mathrm{i}c}$, $x_3 = \omega_9^2 e^{\mathrm{i}b}$ and $x_4 = \omega_9^4 e^{id}$ with $\omega_9 = \exp(2\pi\mathrm{i}/9)$. For later reference, note that the Kronecker product $F_3 \otimes F_3$ is equivalent to an element of $F_9^{(4)}$ ($\Delta_1 = \Delta_2 = I$ in (3.4)), but also to the symmetric block circulant with circulant blocks matrix

$$C_3 \otimes C_3 = \begin{pmatrix} C_3 & \omega C_3 & \omega C_3 \\ \omega C_3 & C_3 & \omega C_3 \\ \omega C_3 & \omega C_3 & C_3 \end{pmatrix} \sim F_3 \otimes F_3 \tag{3.5}$$

and these matrices have defect 16.

The orbit $F_9^{(4)}$ has a two-parameter suborbit of circulant Hadamard matrices $FB_9^{(2)} = \mathrm{circ}(1, u, v, 1, \omega_3 u, \omega_3^2 v, 1, \omega_3^2 u, \omega_3 v)$ [16, 17] with $u, v \in \mathbb{T}$ related to the parameters of $F_9^{(4)}$ in (3.4) through $x_1 = u\bar{v}^2$, $x_2 = \bar{u}\bar{v}$ with $x_3 = \omega_3^2 x_2$ and $x_4 = \omega_3^2 x_2/x_1$. Like $F_9^{(4)}$, this Backelin orbit has generic defect 4. It has 9 circulant one-parameter suborbits with generic defect 6, for $v = \omega_9^{1+3n} u^2$, $u = \omega_9^{1+3n} v$, $uv = \omega_9^{1+3n}$, $n = 0, 1, 2$. At the 27 points where these orbits intersect, the matrices have defect 10.

The orbit $F_9^{(4)}$ has also a one-parameter suborbit of symmetric $BCCB$ Hadamard matrices (see $BC_{9B}^{(1)}$ below), equivalent to the $F_9^{(4)}$ of (3.4) with $x_4 = x_1$ and $x_2 = x_3 = x_1^2$, and with generic defect equal to 10.

Among other suborbits, there is a one-parameter orbit of self-adjoint Hadamard matrices ([4], Prop. 3.4.12), with generic defect equal to 12.

Two isolated matrices of order 9 are also known: the matrix $N_9^{(0)}$[8, 1] is equivalent to a symmetric, not reducible matrix, while the recently described matrix $S_9^{(0)}$ [18] is reducible[1]. Two other matrices, $B_9^{(0)}$ [8, 1] and W_{9A}[19], will be identified below as equivalent to elements in a new non-affine and not reducible $BCCB$ orbit $BC_9^{(2)}$ [2].

[1] As pointed out by a referee, a matrix Q_9 and a one-parameter orbit $Z_9(x)$ are reported in [28]. Q_9 is an isolated matrix neither equivalent to $N_9^{(0)}$ nor to $S_9^{(0)}$, while $Z_9(x)$, which has the generic defect 2, is equivalent to a non-affine suborbit of the full $BC_9^{(2)}$ orbit of the present paper.

[2] The finding that $B_9^{(0)}$ is not isolated but an element in a two-parameter orbit was anticipated in [8] based on the observation that its defect is 2.

4. Numerical experiments

Numerical experiments have indicated that there exists an orbit of Hadamard matrices of order 9 on the form (all elements of absolute value 1, $x, y, u, w \in \mathbb{T}$)

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & x & x & y & u & w & y & w & u \\ x & 1 & x & w & y & u & u & y & w \\ x & x & 1 & u & w & y & w & u & y \\ y & w & u & 1 & x & x & y & u & w \\ u & y & w & x & 1 & x & w & y & u \\ w & u & y & x & x & 1 & u & w & y \\ y & u & w & y & w & u & 1 & x & x \\ w & y & u & u & y & w & x & 1 & x \\ u & w & y & w & u & y & x & x & 1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{4.1}$$

A matrix of this form has several outstanding properties.

(1) Any permutation of $(xyuw)$ results in a matrix that, after permutations of rows and columns, coincides with the original one.
(2) It is symmetric.
(3) It is block circulant, with circulant blocks ($BCCB$),

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} A & B & B^T \\ B^T & A & B \\ B & B^T & A \end{pmatrix} \tag{4.2}$$

with

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & x & x \\ x & 1 & x \\ x & x & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} y & u & w \\ w & y & u \\ u & w & y \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4.3}$$

Let $\sigma = x + y + u + w$. It follows from the $BCCB$ property that

$$\Lambda = \frac{1}{9}(F_3 \otimes F_3) H (F_3 \otimes F_3)^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} 1+2\sigma & & & & & & & & 0 \\ & 1-\sigma+3y & & & & & & & \\ & & 1-\sigma+3y & & & & & & \\ & & & 1-\sigma+3x & & & & & \\ & & & & 1-\sigma+3w & & & & \\ & & & & & 1-\sigma+3u & & & \\ & & & & & & 1-\sigma+3x & & \\ & & & & & & & 1-\sigma+3u & \\ 0 & & & & & & & & 1-\sigma+3w \end{pmatrix} \tag{4.4}$$

is a diagonal matrix with entries equal to the eigenvalues of H, and that any two matrices of the general form (4.1) commute.

For H in (4.1) to be Hadamard, the elements $x, y, u, w \in \mathbb{T}$ cannot all be chosen independently. By enforcing the unitarity constraint, the missing relations between x, y, u and w can be found, and the most general orbit of complex Hadamard matrices compatible with (4.1) can be constructed. As will be shown below, the result is either a non-affine, two-parameter $BCCB$ orbit, to be denoted $BC_9^{(2)}$, or a set of matrices all equivalent to the $BCCB$ matrix $C_3 \otimes C_3$ of (3.5).

5. The unitarity constraint

The unitarity constraint $H^\dagger H = 9I$ on the matrix H in (4.1) is most easily imposed by requiring that the eigenvalues in (4.4) have modulus 3,

$$\begin{aligned} 4\sigma\bar\sigma + 2(\sigma+\bar\sigma) + 1 &= 9 \\ 3x(1-\bar\sigma) + 3\bar x(1-\sigma) + (1-\bar\sigma)(1-\sigma) &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

where in the last equation the condition $x\bar x = 1$ has been used. There are three additional equations where x is replaced by y, u or w.

If $\sigma = x+y+u+w = 1$, all the unitarity conditions (5.1) are satisfied, with no additional constraints on $x, y, u, w \in \mathbb{T}$, and the eigenvalue matrix is simply $\Lambda = 3 \times \mathrm{diag}(1, y, y, x, w, u, x, u, w)$.

Otherwise, if $\sigma \neq 1$, the second equation in (5.1) reads $\mathcal{R}e(3x/(1-\sigma)) = -1/2$ or, again using that $x\bar x = 1$,

$$\frac{3x}{1-\sigma} = -\frac{1}{2} \pm \mathrm{i}\sqrt{\frac{9}{|1-\sigma|^2} - \frac{1}{4}} \tag{5.2}$$

with similar expressions for y, u and w. Adding these relations, and taking into account all sign combinations for the square root terms, one finds five possible conditions on σ,

$$\frac{3\sigma}{1-\sigma} = -2 + \left\{ \begin{array}{c} 4 \\ 2 \\ 0 \\ -2 \\ -4 \end{array} \right\} \mathrm{i}\sqrt{\frac{9}{|1-\sigma|^2} - \frac{1}{4}}$$

In the first and last cases,

$$\frac{3|\sigma|}{|1-\sigma|} = 4\frac{3}{|1-\sigma|}$$

i.e. $|\sigma| = 4$. Such sigmas are not compatible with the first of the equations (5.1). Similarly, in the second and fourth cases, $|2\sigma+1| = 3\sqrt{3}$, again not allowed by (5.1). In the third case, finally, σ equals -2. This is a value compatible with (5.1) and implies (see (5.2)) that x equals ω or ω^2, and correspondingly for y, u and w. Taking into account that the sum of x, y, u and w should equal -2, the final result is that two of these parameters must have the value ω, and the other two ω^2. For the corresponding eigenvalue matrix one finds $\Lambda = 3 \times \mathrm{diag}(-1, 1+y, 1+y, 1+x, 1+w, 1+u, 1+x, 1+u, 1+w)$. Recall that $x = \omega$ implies $1 + x = -\omega^2$ etc, i.e. in addition to -3 there are four eigenvalues equal to -3ω and four equal to $-3\omega^2$.

The above findings are collected in

Theorem 1. *For the elements $x, y, u, w \in \mathbb{T}$ of H in (4.1), the unitarity condition $H^\dagger H = 9I$ implies that either*

$$x + y + u + w = 1$$

or that one pair of x, y, u, w equals ω and the other pair equals ω^2, where $\omega = \exp(2\pi\mathrm{i}/3)$. In this last case

$$x + y + u + w = -2.$$

In the $x+y+u+w = 1$ case, the interdependence between x, y, u and w can be illustrated with the help of a complex parameter ζ:

Lemma 2. *Let $x + y + u + w = 1$ with $x, y, u, w \in \mathbb{T}$, and let $\zeta = 2(x+y) - 1 = -2(u+w) + 1$. Then, for $\zeta \neq \pm 1$,*

1. ζ is a complex number in the intersection of the circular discs $|1+\zeta| \leq 4$ and $|1-\zeta| \leq 4$

2. $x = \frac{1}{4}(1+\zeta)(1+\mathrm{i}\sqrt{\frac{16}{|1+\zeta|^2}-1})$ and $y = \frac{1}{4}(1+\zeta)(1-\mathrm{i}\sqrt{\frac{16}{|1+\zeta|^2}-1})$ or vice versa

3. $u = \frac{1}{4}(1-\zeta)(1+\mathrm{i}\sqrt{\frac{16}{|1-\zeta|^2}-1})$ and $w = \frac{1}{4}(1-\zeta)(1-\mathrm{i}\sqrt{\frac{16}{|1-\zeta|^2}-1})$ or vice versa

Proof. If z_1 and z_2 are of modulus 1, and $z_1 + z_2 = c$, then, for any $0 < |c| \leq 2$, $z_1 = \frac{c}{2}(1 \pm \mathrm{i}\sqrt{\frac{4}{|c|^2}-1})$ and $z_2 = \frac{c}{2}(1 \mp \mathrm{i}\sqrt{\frac{4}{|c|^2}-1})$. □

For each ζ in the allowed region there are therefore 4 different, but equivalent Hadamard matrices. In the exceptional point where $\zeta = 1$, either $x = -\omega$ and $y = -\omega^2$, or vice versa, with $u = -w$ arbitrary in $\mathbb{T}$. This single point in the ζ parameter space therefore corresponds to two instances of a one-parameter set. This phenomenon is an artifact of the ζ parametrization that also manifests itself in the above expressions for u and v: with $\zeta = 1 + \epsilon e^{\mathrm{i}\phi}$, the limit $\epsilon \to 0^+$ depends on the parameter ϕ. The situation where $\zeta \to -1$ is analogous.

6. The new non-affine orbit $BC_9^{(2)}$ and the set $BC_9(-2)$

In terms of orbits of Hadamard matrices, the results of the previous section can be summarized as follows. The full set of symmetric $BCCB$ Hadamard matrices $BC_9(x, y, u, w)$ on the form (4.1) can be seen as 4 instances ($x \leftrightarrow y$ and/or $u \leftrightarrow w$) of a two parameter orbit $BC_9^{(2)}(\zeta)$ where

$$\left.\begin{matrix} x \\ y \end{matrix}\right\} = \frac{1}{4}(1+\zeta)(1 \pm \mathrm{i}\sqrt{\frac{16}{|1+\zeta|^2}-1})$$

$$\left.\begin{matrix} u \\ w \end{matrix}\right\} = \frac{1}{4}(1-\zeta)(1 \pm \mathrm{i}\sqrt{\frac{16}{|1-\zeta|^2}-1}) \tag{6.1}$$

In addition there are six different but equivalent matrices where one pair of x, y, u and w is equal to ω, and the other pair equals ω^2, so that $x + y + u + w = -2$. These matrices will collectively be denoted $BC_9(-2)$.

No other complex Hadamard matrices are compatible with the form (4.1).

The orbit $BC_9^{(2)}$ is a non-affine orbit of symmetric $BCCB$ complex Hadamard matrices, and the defect of a generic element is 2. Since the value of the defect coincides with the number of continuous parameters, $BC_9^{(2)}$ is not contained in any orbit with additional continuous parameters, and it is in particular not a suborbit of the Fourier orbit $F_9^{(4)}$ (for which the defect of a generic element is 4).

The six $BC_9(-2)$ matrices are all equivalent to the matrix $C_3 \otimes C_3$ (or $F_3 \otimes F_3$, a matrix which is also in the Fourier orbit $F_9^{(4)}$), and their defect is 16.

7. Non-reducibility of $BC_9^{(2)}$

For the new orbit $BC_9^{(2)}$ constructed in the previous sections, the question of reducibility has not yet been addressed. A Hadamard matrix of order 9 can at most be H_3-reducible, and if this is the case, it must be equivalent to a dephased Hadamard matrix where the upper left 3×3 submatrix is F_3. If the new orbit were H_3-reducible, in the dephased form there would be at least two elements ω, and two elements ω^2, in such positions that an F_3 submatrix can be generated through equivalence transformations. For arbitrary parameters $x, y \in \mathbb{T}$, this cannot happen. Indeed, there are $9 \times 9 = 81$ instances of dephased matrices, and they all have elements taken from the set $\{1, a, \frac{1}{a}, a^2, \frac{1}{a^2}, \frac{a}{b}, \frac{a^2}{b^2}, \frac{ab}{c}, \frac{a}{bc}, \frac{ab}{c^2}, \frac{c^2}{ab}\}$ where a, b and



FIGURE 8.1. Affine suborbits of $BC_9^{(2)}$, and the defect at intersection points

c are (all different and) equal to any combination of x, y, u and w. No member in the set equals to ω or ω^2 over the entire parameter space, implying that the orbit $BC_9^{(2)}$ is not reducible. For special values of the parameters, on the other hand, H_3-reducibility may occur, as exemplified by the appearance of the matrix $C_3^\dagger \otimes C_3$ for $x = \omega$, $y = \omega^2$, $u = w = 1$.

8. AFFINE SUBORBITS OF $BC_9^{(2)}$

One-parameter suborbits of $BC_9^{(2)}$ will in general be non-affine. However, two cases of affine suborbits can be identified.

8.1. The affine suborbit $BC_{9A}^{(1)}$.

If $(xyuw)$ is a permutation of $(\mu, -\mu, -\omega, -\omega^2)$, with $\mu \in \mathbb{T}$, then $\zeta = \pm 1$, $\mathrm{i}\sqrt{3} \pm 2\mu$ or $-\mathrm{i}\sqrt{3} \pm 2\mu$. The last two possibilities correspond to two cases of two overlapping circles in the complex ζ plane, of radius 2 and with midpoints at $\pm\mathrm{i}\sqrt{3}$ (Figure 8.1). The situation at the points $\zeta = \pm 1$ is more subtle since the μ degree of freedom is hidden in how these points are approached in the complex plane. Indeed, let for instance $\zeta = -1 - \epsilon\mathrm{i}\mu$, $\mu \in \mathbb{T}$, and take $\epsilon \to 0^+$ in (6.1). As a result, $x, y \to \pm\mu$ and $u, w \to -\omega^2$ or $-\omega$, as advertized. As already mentioned, this behavior is an artifact of the parametrization (6.1), and has been noted before in a similar case [10].

Taking $(xyuw) = (\mu, -\mu, -\omega, -\omega^2)$, the resulting suborbit $BC_{9A}^{(1)}$ has the representation (4.2) with

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \mu & \mu \\ \mu & 1 & \mu \\ \mu & \mu & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad B = -\begin{pmatrix} \mu & \omega & \omega^2 \\ \omega^2 & \mu & \omega \\ \omega & \omega^2 & \mu \end{pmatrix}. \tag{8.1}$$

The defect of a generic element of $BC_{9A}^{(1)}$ is 2. Interestingly, although affine, $BC_{9A}^{(1)}$ is not a suborbit of the affine orbit $F_9^{(4)}$.

8.2. **The affine suborbit $BC_{9B}^{(1)}$.**
If $(xyuw)$ is a permutation of $(1,\xi,\omega\xi,\omega^2\xi)$, with $\xi\in\mathbb{T}$, then $\zeta=\pm(1+2\xi)$, $\pm(1+2\omega\xi)$ or $\pm(1+2\omega^2\xi)$ and there are two cases of three overlapping circles in the complex ζ plane, again of radius 2 but with midpoints at ±1 (Figure 8.1). Taking $(xyuw)=(1,\xi,\omega\xi,\omega^2\xi)$, the resulting affine suborbit $BC_{9B}^{(1)}$ has the representation (4.2) with

$$A=\begin{pmatrix}1&1&1\\1&1&1\\1&1&1\end{pmatrix}\quad\text{and}\quad B=\xi\begin{pmatrix}1&\omega&\omega^2\\\omega^2&1&\omega\\\omega&\omega^2&1\end{pmatrix},\tag{8.2}$$

It is straightforward to show that the matrices of $BC_{9B}^{(1)}$ are equivalent to Fourier matrices on the form (3.4) with $\Delta_1=\mathrm{diag}(1,\bar\xi,\bar\xi^2)$ and $\Delta_2=\mathrm{diag}(1,\bar\xi^2,\bar\xi)$, i.e. that the $BC_{9B}^{(1)}$ orbits can be seen as one-parameter intersections of $BC_9^{(2)}$ with the Fourier orbit $F_9^{(4)}$. The defect of a generic element of $BC_{9B}^{(1)}$ turns out to be 10.

Conjecture 3. *$BC_{9A}^{(1)}$ and $BC_{9B}^{(1)}$ are the only affine suborbits of $BC_9^{(2)}$.*

As support for this conjecture, consider the graphs in the complex plane representing the relation $x+y+u+w=1$ characteristic for $BC_9^{(2)}$. In the $BC_{9A}^{(1)}$ case two links add up to zero and can for that reason have any orientation (the μ parameter). In the $BC_{9B}^{(1)}$ case three links add up to zero and the resulting triangle can have any orientation (the ξ parameter). We see no other way for a subgraph to exhibit a similar rotational invariance, and hence no room for an associated affine parameter.

9. One-parameter suborbits with defect 4

The occurrence of a full suborbit with the anomalous defect 10, the $BC_{9B}^{(1)}$ of the previous section, has motivated the search for additional suborbits with a defect different from the generic value 2. A numerical search has revealed 24 one-variable suborbit pieces in $BC_9^{(2)}$ with the anomalous defect 4 (Figure 9.1). Lacking an analytic description, we have chosen not to try to put these pieces together into full suborbits. However, if the two generic pieces[3] shown in Figure 9.2 are complemented by other instances of themselves, obtained by permuting the $(xyuw)$ parameters, one half of the full suborbit structure in Figure 9.1 is obtained. The remaining half follows by taking the mirror image in the real ζ-axis.

10. Special matrices

Of some interest are the points where the $BC_{9A}^{(1)}$ and $BC_{9B}^{(1)}$ orbits intersect each other, other instances of themselves, or the boundary of the parameter domain, see Figure 8.1.

The $BC_{9B}^{(1)}$ orbit intersects another such orbit at the points $\zeta=\pm\mathrm{i}\sqrt{3}$, and the boundary at $\zeta=\pm3$. The corresponding matrices are equivalent to $C_3\otimes C_3\sim F_3\otimes F_3$, see equation (3.5). This matrix is in the Butson class $BH(9,3)$, and its defect is known to be 16 [1].

A $BC_{9B}^{(1)}$ orbit intersects a $BC_{9A}^{(1)}$ orbit at the six points $\zeta=\pm1$, $\pm(1-2\omega)$ and $\pm(1-2\omega^2)$. For instance, with $\mu=1$ or $\xi=-1$, $(xyuw)$ equals $(1,-1,-\omega,-\omega^2)$ and $\zeta=-1$. The resulting matrix $BC_{9A\cap B}$ is a symmetric, block circulant with circulant blocks matrix in the Butson class $BH(9,6)$,

[3] based on ~ 700 points.



FIGURE 9.1. Defect 4 suborbits of $BC_9^{(2)}$



FIGURE 9.2. Defect 4 generic suborbit(s) of $BC_9^{(2)}$

$$BC_{9A\cap B} = \begin{pmatrix} A & B & B^T \\ B^T & A & B \\ B & B^T & A \end{pmatrix} \tag{10.1}$$

with

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad B = -\begin{pmatrix} 1 & \omega & \omega^2 \\ \omega^2 & 1 & \omega \\ \omega & \omega^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{10.2}$$

and it is equivalent to the (Fourier orbit) matrix (3.4) with $\Delta_1 = \mathrm{diag}(1,-1,1)$ and $\Delta_2 = \mathrm{diag}(1,1,-1)$. In whichever form, this matrix is a natural, common seed matrix for all three affine orbits $F_9^{(4)}$, $BC_{9A}^{(1)}$ and $BC_{9B}^{(1)}$, and its defect is 12.

Instances of the $BC_{9A}^{(1)}$ orbit intersect the domain boundary at the four points $\zeta = \pm(1{+}4\omega)$ and $\zeta = \pm(1{+}4\omega^2)$. Taking $(xyuw) = (\omega, -\omega^{2,}, -\omega, -\omega)$ at $\zeta = 1{+}4\omega$

results in the $BCCB$ matrix,

$$BC_{9Ab} = \begin{pmatrix} C_3 & -\omega^2 C_3^\dagger & -\omega^2 C_3^\dagger \\ -\omega^2 C_3^\dagger & C_3 & -\omega^2 C_3^\dagger \\ -\omega^2 C_3^\dagger & -\omega^2 C_3^\dagger & C_3 \end{pmatrix} \tag{10.3}$$

Similarly, taking $(xyuw) = (\omega^2, -\omega, -\omega^2, -\omega^2)$ at $\zeta = 1 + 4\omega^2$ results in $BC_{9Ab}^\dagger$. These two matrices are both in the Butson class $BH(9,6)$ and have defect 10. A direct calculation has shown that they are not equivalent.

Proposition 4. *The Butson matrices BC_{9Ab} and $BC_{9Ab}^\dagger$ are not elements in the Fourier orbit $F_9^{(4)}$.*

Proof. The two matrices BC_{9Ab} and $BC_{9Ab}^\dagger$ are in $BH(9,6)$ and have defect 10. Taking x_1, x_2, x_3 and x_4 in (3.4) as any combination of ± 1, $\pm\omega$ and $\pm\omega^2$, a direct evaluation shows that for the resulting 6^4 $BH(9,6)$ matrices in $F_9^{(4)}$ the defect is 4 in 864 cases, 8 in 243 cases, 12 in 162 cases and 16 in 27 cases, but never 10. □

Finally, two complex Hadamard matrices of order 9 reported earlier can now be identified as elements in $BC_9^{(2)}$. For $(xyuw)$ some permutation of $(\tau\tau\bar{\tau}\bar{\tau})$, with $\tau = \frac{1}{4}(1 + \mathrm{i}\sqrt{15})$, either $\zeta = 0$ or $\zeta = \pm\mathrm{i}\sqrt{15}$. The corresponding element of $BC_9^{(2)}$ is equivalent to the matrix W_{9A} of [19]. For $(xyuw)$ some permutation of $(\epsilon\,\epsilon^3\epsilon^7\epsilon^9)$, with $\epsilon = \exp(2\pi\mathrm{i}/10)$, the corresponding elements of $BC_9^{(2)}$ are equivalent to the $B_9^{(0)}$ of [8, 1]. This matrix is found at the six points where $\zeta = \pm\sqrt{5}$, $\zeta = \pm\mathrm{i}(\sqrt{(5+\sqrt{5})/2} + \sqrt{(5-\sqrt{5})/2})$ or $\zeta = \pm\mathrm{i}(\sqrt{(5+\sqrt{5})/2} - \sqrt{(5-\sqrt{5})/2})$. The defect for the matrices $B_9^{(0)}$ and W_{9A} is 2.

11. MUBs for $N = 3^2$

Mutually unbiased bases (MUBs) in $\mathbb{C}^N$ are closely related to complex Hadamard matrices: taking the basis vectors as columns of a matrix, the standard basis can be represented by the unit matrix, and all other bases will then appear as (mutually unbiased and) in general enphased complex Hadamard matrices. This section serves to illustrate how the results of the present paper are related to such bases in dimension $N = 9$.

Complete sets of $N+1$ MUBs exist for all prime and powers of a prime dimensions N (for recent reviews, see [20, 21]). For example, for $N = 9 = 3^2$, the complete set $\{B_i\}_{i=0\ldots9}$ of MUBs given in [22, 23] have the form $B_0 = I$ and $B_i = \frac{1}{3}D_i(F_3 \otimes F_3)$ where the unitary, diagonal matrices D_i are specified in Table 1. The D_i matrices form a closed set under the product $D_i^\dagger D_j = D_k$ according to the pattern displayed for the M_i matrices in Table 2.

Several other complete sets of MUBs have been shown to be equivalent to this set in the sense that one set can be obtained from another by means of an overall unitary transformation, c.f. Ref [20].

Of particular interest in the context of the present paper is the complete set $\{M_i\}_{i=0\ldots9}$ which is obtained from the $\{B_i\}$ set through left multiplication by (the unitary matrix) $\frac{1}{3}(F_3 \otimes F_3)^\dagger$, i.e. [4]

$$\begin{aligned} M_0 &= \frac{1}{3}(F_3 \otimes F_3)^\dagger \text{ or, equivalently, } \frac{1}{3}F_3 \otimes F_3 \\ M_1 &= I \\ M_i &= \frac{1}{9}(F_3 \otimes F_3)^\dagger D_i (F_3 \otimes F_3), \;\; i = 2, ..., 9 \end{aligned}$$

[4] note that $(F_3 \otimes F_3)^\dagger$ and $F_3 \otimes F_3$ are column permutation equivalent.

D_1	D_2	D_3	D_4	D_5	D_6	D_7	D_8	D_9
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	ω^2	ω	ω	1	ω^2	ω^2	ω	1
1	ω^2	ω	ω	1	ω^2	ω^2	ω	1
1	1	1	ω	ω	ω	ω^2	ω^2	ω^2
1	ω	ω^2	ω^2	1	ω	ω	ω^2	1
1	1	1	ω^2	ω^2	ω^2	ω	ω	ω
1	1	1	ω	ω	ω	ω^2	ω^2	ω^2
1	1	1	ω^2	ω^2	ω^2	ω	ω	ω
1	ω	ω^2	ω^2	1	ω	ω	ω^2	1

TABLE 1. Diagonals of the MUB unitaries D_i as obtained from [23]. Note that $D_3 = D_2^\dagger$, $D_7 = D_4^\dagger$, $D_8 = D_6^\dagger$ and $D_9 = D_5^\dagger$.

	M_1	M_2	M_3	M_4	M_5	M_6	M_7	M_8	M_9
$M_1^\dagger$	I	M_2	M_3	M_4	M_5	M_6	M_7	M_8	M_9
$M_2^\dagger$	M_3	I	M_2	M_6	M_4	M_5	M_9	M_7	M_8
$M_3^\dagger$	M_2	M_3	I	M_5	M_6	M_4	M_8	M_9	M_7
$M_4^\dagger$	M_7	M_8	M_9	I	M_2	M_3	M_4	M_5	M_6
$M_5^\dagger$	M_9	M_7	M_8	M_3	I	M_2	M_6	M_4	M_5
$M_6^\dagger$	M_8	M_9	M_7	M_2	M_3	I	M_5	M_6	M_4
$M_7^\dagger$	M_4	M_5	M_6	M_7	M_8	M_9	I	M_2	M_3
$M_8^\dagger$	M_6	M_4	M_5	M_9	M_7	M_8	M_3	I	M_2
$M_9^\dagger$	M_5	M_6	M_4	M_8	M_9	M_7	M_2	M_3	I

TABLE 2. Multiplication table for $M_i^\dagger M_j$. Note the block circulant with circulant blocks structure.

Except for M_0 and M_1, the M_i matrices are symmetric, *block circulant with circulant blocks* mutually unbiased Hadamard matrices, i.e. (apart from normalization) matrices of the general form (4.1) investigated in the previous sections. The outstanding features [24] of this set are that, for i, j, k in $\{1, 2, ..., 9\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} M_i^3 &= I \\ M_i M_j &= M_j M_i \\ M_i^\dagger M_j &= M_k, \text{ see Table 2,} \end{aligned}$$

all properties inherited from the $\{D_i\}_{i=1,...,9}$ matrices. Furthermore, $M_3 = M_2^\dagger$, $M_7 = M_4^\dagger$, $M_8 = M_6^\dagger$ and $M_9 = M_5^\dagger$, i.e. for each M_i there is an M_j such that $M_i^\dagger = M_j$. This set of MUBs is therefore invariant under Hermitan conjugation.

The parameters in (4.1) corresponding to the $\{M_i\}_{i=2,...,9}$ matrices are easily identified through inspection of the eigenvalues. A comparison of Table 1 with the eigenvalues (4.4) for $\sigma = 1$ and $\sigma = -2$ shows that for M_2, M_3, M_5 and M_9 the parameters $(xyuw)$ in (4.1) are permutations of $(1, 1, \omega, \omega^2)$, see Table 3. These matrices are therefore equal to elements in the suborbit $BC_{9B}^{(1)}$ in Section 8 (the intersection of the $BC_9^{(2)}$ of Theorem 1 with $F_9^{(4)}$) corresponding to $\xi = 1$. For $-M_4, -M_6, -M_7$ and $-M_8$ the parameters $(xyuw)$ are permutations of

	M_2	M_3	$-M_4$	M_5	$-M_6$	$-M_7$	$-M_8$	M_9
x	1	1	ω^2	ω	ω^2	ω	ω	ω^2
y	ω^2	ω	ω^2	1	ω	ω	ω^2	1
u	1	1	ω	ω^2	ω	ω^2	ω^2	ω
w	ω	ω^2	ω	1	ω^2	ω^2	ω	1

TABLE 3. Parameters in the $BC_9(x, y, u, w)$ orbit (see (4.1)) corresponding to the M_i matrices. Note that $u = \bar{x}$ and $w = \bar{y}$.

$(\omega, \omega, \omega^2, \omega^2)$, see Table 3, characteristic for matrices in the exceptional set $BC_9(-2)$ also identified in Theorem 1.

It should be pointed out that as Hadamard matrices, the M_i matrices for $i \geq 2$ are all equivalent to each other, and to the $\frac{1}{3}C_3 \otimes C_3$ matrix of (3.5) (for instance, $-M_7 = \frac{1}{3}C_3 \otimes C_3$). Their common defect is therefore 16.

As a final remark, recall from Section 4 that a permutation of the $(xyuw)$ parameters in (4.1) can be undone by permutations of rows and columns. Specifically, a permutation of the parameters $(xyuw)$ in Table 3 either leaves the set $\{M_i\}_{i=1,\ldots,9}$ invariant, or gives rise to one of two additional, but equivalent, sets $\{P_1' M_i P_1\}_{i=1,\ldots,9}$ or $\{P_2' M_i P_2\}_{i=1,\ldots,9}$ where P_1 and P_2 are (unitary) permutation matrices that interchange y and u, or u and w, respectively.

Explicit expressions for complete sets of MUBs in 9 dimensions have been published several times. It has been verified that the versions given in references [25, 26, 27][5] indeed are equivalent to the $\{M_i\}$ set of the present section (and therefore also to the set of references [22, 23]).

Acknowledgement. Questions and suggestions by a referee are gratefully acknowledged. We are particularly indebted to her/him for providing us with a copy of the not generally available reference [28].

[5]There is a misprint in Table 5 of [25]. The corrected entries read $|3_4\rangle = 1\,\bar{\omega}\,1\,\omega\,1\,\omega\,\omega\,1\,\omega$ and $|3_5\rangle = 1\,\omega\,\omega\,\omega\,\bar{\omega}\,\bar{\omega}\,\omega\,\bar{\omega}\,\bar{\omega}$. There is also a misprint in the B_3 of Appendix G in [27]. The corrected matrix elements read $B_3(2,5) = \alpha_3^2$, $B_3(3,5) = 1$ and $B_3(4,5) = \alpha_3$.

References

[1] W. Bruzda, W. Tadej and K. Życzkowski, *Complex Hadamard Matrices*, http://chaos.if.uj.edu.pl/~karol/hadamard/, September 2015.

[2] W. Tadej and K. Życzkowski, *A concise guide to complex Hadamard matrices,* Open Syst. & Inf. Dyn. **13**, 133 (2006).

[3] I. Bengtsson, W. Bruzda, Å. Ericsson, J.-Å. Larsson, W. Tadej and K. Życzkowski, *Mutually unbiased bases and Hadamard matrices of order six*, J. Math. Phys. **48**, 052106 (2007).

[4] F. Szöllősi, *Construction, classification and parametrization of complex Hadamard matrices,* PhD Thesis, Central European University, Budapest (2011); e-print arXiv:1110.5590v1 [math.CO].

[5] B. R. Karlsson, *H_2-reducible complex Hadamard matrices of order 6*, Lin. Alg. Appl. **434**, 239 (2011).

[6] P. J. Davis, *Circulant matrices*, John Wiley and Sons, New York, (1979).

[7] B. R. Karlsson, *Three-parameter complex Hadamard matrices of order 6*, Lin. Alg. Appl. **434**, 247 (2011).

[8] K. Beauchamp and R. Nicoara, *Orthogonal maximal abelian *-subalgebras of the 6 × 6 matrices*, e-print arXiv:math/0609076v1 [math.OA].

[9] M. Matolcsi and F. Szöllősi, *Towards a classification of 6 × 6 complex Hadamard matrices*, Open Syst. & Inf. Dyn. **15:2**, 93 (2008).

[10] B. R. Karlsson, *Two-parameter complex Hadamard matrices for $N = 6$*, J. Math. Phys. **50**, 082104 (2009).

[11] F. Szöllősi, *A two-parameter family of complex Hadamard matrices of order 6 induced by hypocycloids,* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **138**, 921–928 (2010).

[12] F. Szöllősi, *Complex Hadamard matrices of order 6: a four-parameter family*, J. London Math. Soc. **85** (3), 616-632 (2012).

[13] G. Björck and R. Fröberg, *A Faster Way to Count the Solutions of Inhomogeneous Systems of Algebraic Equations, with Applications to Cyclic n-roots*, J. Symbolic Computation **12**, 329-336 (1991).

[14] U. Haagerup, *Orthogonal maximal abelian *-subalgebras of the n × n matrices and cyclic n-roots*, in *Operator Algebras and Quantum Field Theory* (S. Doplicher, R. Longo, J. E. Roberts, L. Zsido, eds), International Press, Cambridge, 296-322, (1997).

[15] B. R. Karlsson, unpublished.

[16] J. Backelin, *Square multiples n gives infinite many cyclic n-roots*, Reports, Department of Mathematics, University of Stockholm, 1989 - No 8, (1989).

[17] J.-C. Faugère, *Finding all the solutions of cyclic 9 using Gröbner Basis techniques*, Computer Mathematics (Matsuyama, 2001), Lecture Notes Ser. Comput., 9, World Sci. Publ. 1–12 (2001).

[18] D. McNulty and S. Weigert, *Isolated Hadamard matrices from mutually unbiased product bases,* J. Math. Phys. **53**, 122202 (2012).

[19] F. Szöllősi, *Exotic complex Hadamard matrices and their equivalence*, Cryptography and Communications **2** (2), 187-198 (2010).

[20] C. Godsil and A. Roy, *Equiangular lines, mutually unbiased bases, and spin models*, European Journal of Combinatorics **30,** 246–262 (2009).

[21] T. Durt, B.-G. Englert, I.Bengtsson and K. Życzkowski, *On Mutually Unbiased Bases*, Int. J. Quant. Inf. **8**, 535-640 (2010).

[22] W.K. Wootters and B.C. Fields, *Optimal State-Determination by Mutually Unbiased Measurements*, Ann. Phys. **191**, 363-381 (1989).

[23] S. Chaturvedi, *Aspects of mutually unbiased bases in odd-prime-power dimensions*, Phys. Rev. **A65**, 044301 (2002).

[24] M. Combescure, *Block-circulant matrices with circulant blocks, Weil sums, and mutually unbiased bases. II. The prime power case*, J. Math. Phys. **50**, 032104 (2009).

[25] P. K. Aravind, *Solution to the King's Problem in Prime Power Dimensions*, Z. Naturforsch. **58a**, 85-92 (2003).

[26] A. B. Klimov, L. L. Sánchez-Soto and H. de Guise, *Multicomplementary operators via finite Fourier transform*, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **38,** 2747–2760 (2005).

[27] M. Wieśniak, T. Paterek, and A. Zeilinger, *Entanglement in mutually unbiased bases,* New J. Phys. **13**, 053047 (2011), see also arXiv:1102.2080v3 [quant-ph].

[28] F. Szöllősi, *Komplex Hadamard mátrixok konstrukciója és paraméterezése,* MSc Thesis (in Hungarian), BUTE, Budapest, Hungary (2008).

Uppsala University, Department of Physics and Astronomy, Box 516, SE-751 20, Uppsala, Sweden
E-mail address: bengt.karlsson@physics.uu.se